



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

THE ENGLISH RITE. Being a Synopsis of the Sources and Revisions of the Book of Common Prayer. With an Introduction and an Appendix. F. E. BRIGHTMAN. Rivingtons. 1915. 2 Vols. Pp. Vol. I, cccxx, 453. Vol. II, 454-1068. 42s.

These huge volumes contain a vast amount of valuable matter and witness to almost incalculable labor of an exacting kind. More than a thousand (to be exact, 1017) of the pages numbered in Arabic are devoted to a "synopsis" or parallel column view of three editions of the English Prayer Book, those of 1549, 1552, and 1661; a fourth column (which actually stands first) being devoted to "sources." The changes introduced into the book at the revisions of 1559 and 1604 are noted by reference numbers, as are also variations in different editions of the Elizabethan and Jacobean books, and the matter derived from the Scottish book of 1637 and from the collections and suggestions of Bishop Cosin and Bishop Wren and the non-conformists at the Savoy Conference. In the column of sources, the text of Latin originals and that of German originals is distinguished by a difference of type; Gothic letters indicate the particular Latin sources, and abbreviations tell of the earliest (extant) texts — Gelasian or Gregorian or Leonine or Menardian — in which each item is found, while antique letters refer the items from the German to their several originals. In the three columns of successive texts four styles of type are used, each in two sizes, for (1) matter other than translation from the Bible, which existed before 1549 in an independent form and was incorporated in the book of that date; (2) matter of 1549; (3) matter of 1552; (4) matter again other than translations from the Bible, of a date later than 1552. In all this we are reminded of Maskell's *Liturgiae Britannicae*; and the simpler arrangement and less particular form of the older book will seem to many students still to commend it for every practical use. Perhaps the example which is really the test of the book of 1559, the form of words at the administration of the consecrated elements in the Communion Office, shows best the difference in the methods of the two editors. Maskell, who put the books of 1552 and 1559 into one column and those of 1604 and 1637 (Scottish) into another, printed separately the simply commemorative forms of the second Edwardine book and the combined Elizabethan forms, making the change of words and its date perfectly clear; Brightman brings the words of 1549 over into the 1661 column, the numeral '1' before them and the asterisk after them indicating to the reader (who, if he does not remember their meaning, must turn back from

page 701 to page ii in the other volume,) that the restoration was really made in 1559, more than a century before the date at the head of the column. So it is with the additions to the Catechism; they stand under 1661, and only an inconspicuous "4" on page 787 and a "\*" on page 791 tell us that they date from 1604. The reader recognizes that the most laborious pains have been taken to note every variation of typography, even printers' slips and irregularities of spelling and indications of personal equation and devices to secure "justification," most of which have not the slightest literary or historical meaning. And in this connection we have to note great waste of space. It is interesting indeed to read the epistles and gospels in the Great Bible version from which they were taken until 1661 and compare their wording with that of the King James version which was substituted for it at that date, and also to have before the eye the Vulgate text in which these Lessons were read in the Sarum Use, noting the differences in length and other variations; but to print all the epistles and gospels in English at full length, once for 1549 and once for 1552, where the variations, in large part due to carelessness or accident, were only those of two editions of the same English version, and to note every least divergence, appears unnecessarily "meticulous." And to print all the introits in full in the 1549 column, leaving (of course) the other columns blank, adds to the conviction that the book has been unnecessarily padded; for the collects, introits, epistles, and gospels of the week before Easter use up seventy-nine pages. The editor himself evidently felt that this fulness of printing must be in some wise restrained; for the Psalter is represented under 1661 by the title of the book, the title and the first verse of the first psalm, a line of dots, and the last verse of the one hundred and fiftieth psalm; and we have to look elsewhere for the original text of the whole book of Psalms.

Thus far what has been written by way of criticism may seem rather ungracious as spent upon the result of great labor on the part of a scholar who must have found delight in it. But something must be said as to the column of "sources," in which this work differs from that of Maskell, and which shows that it has a wider and more helpful purpose. Even here we are disappointed at finding that the source given in each instance is the proximate source rather than the original. The prayer of St. Chrysostom indeed is printed in the Greek; but the source of *Gloria in excelsis* is given as the Latin text in the missal with a note after *hominibus bonae voluntatis*, "S. Luk. ii. 14 unto men a good wyll," but no indication that the translation

in this phrase was from the Greek text of the time; and the Nicene Creed is given in Latin, not in Greek, though it seems certain, as Bishop Dowden has shown, that Cranmer was led by a faulty Greek text to omit "holy" from the marks of the Church. In the Burial of the Dead the sequence *Media vita* is given in Latin, with a reference for the first clause to Job xiv and to the lesson in the old office; but for the rest no source is given except the compline service of the third Sunday in Lent in Sarum Use, and we are not pointed to the Greek "Trisagion" from which "Agios o theos" was taken. We have no help for finding the biblical sources of the versicles and responses at Morning and Evening Prayer, or the biblical and patristic sources of the several parts of the *Te Deum*; while the attribution of the sources of the prayer of consecration in the Communion service is confused and unsatisfactory. But all the proximate attribution of sources is interesting; and in particular the inexperienced student will be surprised to see how much was derived from German (or, as the word was used then, Dutch) formularies; not indeed in matters relating to doctrine but in forms of words, especially exhortations and the like. (Again, it would seem that this ought not to have extended so far as to give the source of the gospel in the Baptism of Infants in a German translation.)

It remains to speak of the learned historical introduction to the work, and of the notes contained in it and following it on "the result of the revisions."

Beginning with a concise sketch of the way in which by the beginning of the sixteenth century the Roman rite had come to prevail throughout the West, of the groups of books in which it was contained, and the sacramentaries in which we can to some extent trace its history, the author shows that "the course of things in England was parallel to what it was elsewhere and the resulting situation was the same." The position held by the Use of Sarum is noticed as testified by the fact that before the year 1545 the Missal of that Use had been printed in 48 editions, the Portuis in 48, and the Primer in about 170. Mention is made of the so-called Gallican use in its Ambrosian and its Mozarabic forms, and of the liturgy of the orthodox East in the Byzantine service-books. The movements for liturgical reform are noted, with special mention of the Breviary of Quiñones, of which more than a hundred editions were published within thirty years; and the German substitutes, involving presently the use of the vernacular, are treated quite fully. Then along lines which are sufficiently familiar, the English reforms are traced from the publication of the Great Bible and Marshall's

Primer to the Book of Common Prayer of 1549; and sufficiently full attention is given to the successive revisions until that of 1661. Of special value is section VIII, with its consideration of the "principal sources" — really all the sources — from which the book of 1549 was compiled, biblical and traditional and reformational, and this latter along the three lines of continental Catholic, Anglican, and Lutheran—though, as the author says, there is no Lutheranism in the book.

It may be well to mention the points in which the general character of the new rite is noted, namely: The books are reduced to three — the Bible, the Psalter, and the one volume of breviary, processional, missal, and manual; the whole is in English; rite and ceremony are simplified; there are no metrical hymns; all benedictions of things, "except of course of the matter of some of the sacraments," are omitted; invocations of saints and allusion to their merits and intercession are excluded; and, as matters of form, the book is printed almost entirely in black and there is no musical notation. A table exhibits the relation of the Divine Service (matins and evensong) of the first book to the traditional service and to contemporary reforms; and in another table the relation of the "Mass" in the same first book to the traditional order and to some Lutheran orders is shown. Section IX on the ordination-book of 1550 is very instructive, with accounts of traditional rites and Bucer's proposed substitute for them. The ritual products of the reign of Elizabeth, the slight changes under James I., and the extensive revision after the Restoration are all treated in a careful way, the antecedents and the results being as thoroughly studied and discussed as the limitations of the work allow.

The Notes, which are printed as parts of the Introduction, and not as conspicuously as their importance would warrant, consist of a great number of paragraphs, each referred to its page in the four-column "synopsis." They have a wide range of history, explanation, comparison, and criticism, and must all be read by any one who would appreciate their varying value. Some examples may be given as in a way illustrating all. Under the year 1549, with a reference to pp. 200 sq. of the text, is a full scheme of the Introits, with a study of the principles on which they were selected, very curious, not to say ingenious. Presently we find, "p. 220, Collect; see *Journal of Theol. Studies* xiii, p. 562"; and turning to page 220, we find that it is the Collect for Christmas Day; but we are not edified. After a while, we are told by a reference to p. 604 (in the other volume) that the Collect for St. Mary Magdalene's

day is "perhaps the worst in the book"; again, referring to the Nicene Creed on p. 648, we have several interesting notices of variations between the originals and the translation, including the omission of "holy" already mentioned. There soon follows an instructive note on the offertory. A long note on the several forms in which the institution of the Eucharist is recorded or recited shows careful study and is of great value; but presently we are rather startled by the expression of an opinion that the blessing — "The peace of God," etc. — "is an anticlimax after communion, and no doubt came into use just because the people had not as a rule communicated in the Mass." The notes on the book of 1661 call attention to "the originally unauthorized insertion of the musical colon in *Te Deum*, to enable it to be sung to a chant, in spite of its structure"; and the remark is ventured that if "all kneeling," before the collects at morning prayer, is intended to include the priest, "it is obviously ridiculous"; while the placing of a prayer for the Sovereign before the collect for the day in the Communion Office is called an "unhappy transference," "a good instance of the profound lack of appreciation, on the part of the Carolines, of the liturgical precedents which on occasion they were fond of invoking."

The intention and purpose of this work, and hardly less their execution, have called for an extended notice, in which perhaps what seem defects and causes of disappointment have been more fully mentioned than have the marks of wide and thorough scholarship furnished very generously with references. But to those who can handle the volumes, verify their historical statements, and judge the opinions expressed in them, they will bring a wealth of special learning not easily exhaustible and not for many a year to be again gathered. A complete index to such a work would be a practical impossibility; but there ought to be a full table of contents for the introduction.

The Appendix treats of two observances which the editor holds to appertain to the integrity of the English rite, though not contained in the Book of Common Prayer — The Bidding of the Bedes and the Rogation Procession; but of these we have not the space to write.

SAMUEL HART.

BERKELEY DIVINITY SCHOOL.